



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,454	01/17/2002	William V. Da Palma	BOC9-2001-0001 (236)	6426
40987	7590	09/21/2004		
AKERMAN SENTERFITT P. O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			EXAMINER BADERMAN, SCOTT T	
			ART UNIT 2113	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/052,454

Applicant(s)

DA PALMA ET AL.

Examiner

Scott T Baderman

Art Unit

2113

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 4 and 5 are objected to because of the following informalities: In lines 2 and 1, respectively, "time-out sensitive task" should be "time-out susceptible task". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McDermott (6,584,587).

As in claims 1 and 14, McDermott discloses a method of managing at least one client computer program (i.e., within processing system including the watchdog module) in a managed application environment comprising: receiving a request from at least one of a plurality of client computer programs (watchdog module) to begin a timer corresponding to an identified task executing within a particular thread of execution of said client computer program, wherein said identified task has been identified as a time-out susceptible task (i.e., by setting timer implies that it is susceptible) (column 4: lines 22-38); starting a timer (for a respective time-out value) in another separate thread (i.e., the watchdog module is interpreted as executing on a different thread than the task module) of execution which corresponds to said request and said time-out susceptible task (Figures 2 and 3, column 4: lines 39-62, column 5: lines 3-19); timing said time-out susceptible task (Figures 2 and 3, column 4: lines 39-62, column 5: lines 3-19); and if said timer expires, performing a recovery action (reset) corresponding to said time-out susceptible task (column 5: lines 3-19, column 5: line 66 – column 6: line 22).

As in claims 2 and 15, McDermott discloses a method wherein said timer executes within a process separate from said time-out susceptible task (i.e., the watchdog module and the timer chip are interpreted as a separate process of the task module) (column 4: line 22 – column 5: line 19).

As in claims 3, 5, 16 and 18, McDermott discloses a method wherein said recovery action comprises destroying said particular thread of execution (i.e., by performing a hardware reset,

Art Unit: 2113

the thread is destroyed) (column 5: lines 3-19).

As in claims 4, 6, 17 and 19, McDermott discloses a method wherein said recovery action comprises restarting said time-out susceptible task (column 5: lines 3-19).

As in claims 7 and 20, McDermott discloses a method wherein said recovery action comprises forcing said client computer program to discontinue execution (i.e., by performing hardware reset, execution is discontinued) (column 5: lines 3-19).

As in claims 8 and 21, McDermott discloses a method that further comprising: receiving a request from said client computer program to stop said timer (i.e., “push back” timer chip) (column 4: lines 23-38).

As in claims 9 and 22, McDermott discloses a method of managing at least one client computer program in a managed application environment comprising: identifying a process of a client computer program, wherein said process includes at least one time-out susceptible task executing in a particular thread of execution (column 4: lines 22-38); defining named timers (time-out values) corresponding to said time-out susceptible tasks (i.e., since each task has a predetermined timeout value, the timer chip could be interpreted as performing the same function as multiple timers) (Figures 2-3, column 4: lines 23-62); receiving a request to enable one of said timers from said client computer program, wherein said request specifies a particular one of said timers corresponding to one of said time-out susceptible tasks which said client computer

Art Unit: 2113

program has started to execute (Figure 3, column 4: lines 23-62); enabling said particular one of said timers (Figure 3, column 4: lines 23-62); creating a hash table entry (task table) for said particular one of said timers (Figure 3, column 4: lines 23-62); timing said time-out susceptible task, wherein said timer executes within a separate thread of execution (Figures 2 and 3, column 4: lines 39-62, column 5: lines 3-19); and if said enabled timer expires, destroying said process in said client computer program (column 5: lines 3-19).

As in claims 10 and 23, McDermott discloses a method wherein said timer executes in a process separate from said identified process (column 4: line 22 – column 5: line 19).

As in claims 11 and 24, McDermott discloses a method further comprising: restarting said process in said client computer program (column 5: lines 3-19).

As in claims 12 and 25, McDermott discloses a method further comprising: receiving a request to stop said particular one of said timers from said client computer program (column 4: lines 23-38).

As in claim 13, the Applicant is directed to claim 9 above.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

See form PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott T Baderman whose telephone number is (703) 305-4644. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:45 AM-4:15 PM, first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (703) 305-9713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Scott T Baderman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2113

STB